

## REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action of January 26, 2006. Reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 4, 11-13, and 17-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,897,543 (the '543 patent). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The '543 patent and the present patent application have the exact same set of four inventors (Shih, Huang, O, and Liu). An earlier-filed patent can only be a valid §102(e) reference if it was filed by a different inventive entity. Because the inventors listed on the '543 patent and the inventors listed on the present patent application are identical, this requirement is not met. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 14-16 are therefore allowable.

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 1-19 are patentable. This application is therefore in condition for

allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 3/6/06

G. Victor Treyz

Reg. No. 36,294

Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 45851